



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/656,041	09/04/2003	Sajeev Madhavan	200209680-01	8483
22879	7590	05/26/2009	EXAMINER	
HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400			CHO, HONG SOL	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER			
	2419			
NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE			
05/26/2009	ELECTRONIC			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

JERRY.SHORMA@HP.COM
ipa.mail@hp.com
jessica.l.fusek@hp.com



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES**

Application Number: 10/656,041
Filing Date: September 04, 2003
Appellant(s): MADHAVAN, SAJEEV

John P. Wagner, Jr. (Reg. No. 35398)
For Appellant

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

This is in response to the appeal brief filed 3/13/2009 appealing from the Office action mailed 11/20/2008.

(1) Real Party in Interest

A statement identifying by name the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

(2) Related Appeals and Interferences

The examiner is not aware of any related appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

(3) Status of Claims

The statement of the status of claims contained in the brief is correct.

(4) Status of Amendments After Final

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

The summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief is correct.

(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

The appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is substantially correct. The changes are as follows:

(7) Claims Appendix

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

(8) Evidence Relied Upon

6128664	Yanagidate et al	10-2000
7047561	Lee	05-2006

(9) Grounds of Rejection

The following grounds of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
2. Claims 1-7, 9-15 and 17-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yanagidate et al (US 6128664), hereinafter referred to as Yanagidate, in view of Lee (US 7047561).

Re claims 1, 9 and 17, Yanagidate discloses an address-translating device providing address translation between a terminal (figure 2, element 12a) with a private address, 10.1.1.20, located in a private network and a terminal (figure 2, element 11a) with a public address, 133.110.10.31, (*first public IP address*) located in a public network

(automatically generating network address translation (NAT) data to enable a private host having a private IP address to communicate with a public host having a first public IP address, said private host being connected to a private network, said public host being connected to a public network, figure 2; column 5, lines 13-20). Yanagidate discloses the address-translating device providing one of public addresses, 202.10.10.1 and 202.10.10-14, from an address translation table for communication to the terminal in the public network (providing address translation between the private IP address and a second public IP address, the second public IP address being employed as one of a source IP address and a destination IP address for routing the communication between the private host and the public host through the public network, column 5, lines 32-36). Yanagidate fails to disclose consulting a security policy associated with the private host to determine whether a communication between the private host and the public host is permissible before providing address translation service. Lee discloses examining an incoming and outgoing packets against security policies to restrict access to/from internal IP network (column 4, lines 22-26). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the address-translating device to implement the packet filter of Lee so that an access to the public network would be restricted based on filtering rules for secure communications.

Re claims 2 and 10, Yanagidate discloses all of the limitations of the base claim, but fails to disclose implementing an access list on security policy. Lee discloses using a packet filter with filtering rules (*a security policy with an access list*) (column 9, lines 17-21). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to modify the address-translating device to implement the packet filter with filtering rules of Lee so that an access to the public network would be restricted based on filtering rules for secure communications.

Re claims 3, 11 and 18, Yanagidate discloses one of second public addresses being a shared public IP address if the communication is initiated by the private host (column 5, lines 59-64).

Re claims 4, 12 and 19, Yanagidate discloses a second public address being a shared public IP address if the communication is initiated by the public host (column 7, lines 7-15).

Re claims 5 and 13, Yanagidate discloses the address-translating device with address translation table (a NAT table) (figure 2, element 14c).

Re claims 6 and 14, Yanagidate discloses sending a packet to a terminal to see if the terminal is reachable and removing the second public address from the address translation table if not reachable (*detecting a removal of said private host from said private network; and removing, using said software, said second public IP address from said database responsive to said detecting said removal of said private host*, column 7, lines 7-15).

Re claims 7 and 15, Yanagidate discloses all of the limitations of the base claim, but fails to disclose a packet filter with a generic security policy. Lee discloses using a packet filter with filtering rules (*a generic security policy*) (column 9, lines 17-21). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the address-translating device to implement the packet filter with

filtering rules of Lee so that an access to the public network would be restricted based on filtering rules for secure communications.

Claims 8 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yanagidate in view of Lee and further in view of Aukia et al (US 7047561), hereinafter referred to as Aukia.

Re claims 8 and 16, Yanagidate and Lee disclose all of the limitations of the base claim, but fail to disclose automatically generating NAT data for all private hosts affected by said generic policy after said generic policy is modified using said software. Aukia discloses modifying filtering rules to be used for a packet classifier. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Yanagidate and Lee to implement the feature of modifying filtering rules so that modified security policy would be utilized in providing address translation service.

(10) Response to Argument

The applicant argues that claims are patentable over Yanagidate (US 6128664) in view of Lee (US 7047561) by stating that Lee's filtering is packet based whereas the present claimed invention uses host policy to determine communication permission. The examiner respectfully disagrees. Lee discloses determining whether to allow communications which are directly related to the desired service to pass through hybrid

firewall with the help of an application proxy (figure 1, element 102) and control logic (figure 1, element 104) (column 4, line 63 to column 5, line 3), where control logic applies security policy to the various components and processes of firewall (column 5, lines 39-51). The Examiner believes that pending claims read on the references applied.

(11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix

No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the examiner in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner's answer.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,

/Hong Cho/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2419

Conferees:

/Pankaj Kumar/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2419

/Derrick W Ferris/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2416